

evening. So drafts have been shared back and forth. All I said was that I came over to the floor to support the rule to permit this issue to be addressed under suspension, and I don't have in my hand what may be the latest version.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, I know my colleague would certainly share this concern to support the rule, but we like the idea of seeing what it is that we're about to vote upon before we do that. I know that may be an unusual request under this majority, but I think that is definitely fair. And I will say that I think that it's right and correct that Members have a chance to see what it is that they're voting upon, rather than having something thrown upon them.

And we have Mrs. WILSON, who has legislation that we've offered probably a dozen times on our quest to defeat the previous question on rules so that we could at least allow consideration of this. And so that has led us, I believe, to this point.

But I think it is just absolute lunacy to believe that we are, at this moment, in a position to go ahead and vote upon something that we don't know what it consists of. And I know my friend would agree with that, that we really shouldn't have a pattern like that.

Ms. HARMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I would be happy to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield 30 seconds to Ms. HARMAN.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, just to respond to that, I'm not interested in lunacy, and I know that Mr. DREIER is not, and I'm sure that Ms. WILSON and Mr. HOEKSTRA are not either.

There is a way to solve this problem correctly. I believe that the draft, which I'm certain will be circulated to everybody imminently, I believe that you will see that it is a very careful and balanced effort to address this problem, and it has been shared.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentlewoman would yield, I think I've got it in my hands right now.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. The gentleman says he has a copy of the bill in his hand. I would remind the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, who is my good friend, that this rule is to make in order a suspension day.

Mr. DREIER. I understand that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I'm glad you do understand it.

I would ask the gentleman from Texas to ask his Republican colleagues on the Intelligence Committee why they didn't share the bill with the Rules Committee Republicans. We cannot control what you do or do not do.

And under the circumstances, Ms. HARMAN just made it very clear to you that the goalposts keep moving. You try to act as if you don't know that for a year and a half that this has been

going on here in this intelligence community, working with this administration, trying to take care of this matter.

Now understand this. First, you said on that side that Congress needed to clarify that the government shouldn't need a warrant to collect foreign-to-foreign communications. There was never any disagreement about that, and stop saying it to the American public.

Then they said they wanted broader authority to conduct electronic surveillance of terrorist communications. We agreed to that.

Then they said they wanted immunity for the telecommunications carriers. We agreed to give them prospective immunity and consider retrospective immunity when we get back.

Last night, not yesterday, not midnight to noon, and some people have gotten caught in the dark, last night, the congressional leadership was willing to make further changes for Director McConnell. He said that with those changes he would support the bill because it would, in his word, "significantly" enhance America's security.

But after this agreement was reached, congressional Republicans insisted on a much broader bill giving the Attorney General, not the Court, the discretion to make decisions about surveillance involving Americans. Clearly, in my judgment, as I said previously, you're not negotiating in good faith.

I remind you once again that this rule is to make in order a suspension day. You will have all the time you need to do all the reading you need to do.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 21½ minutes. The gentleman from Florida has 13½ minutes.

□ 1345

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we just heard it straight out: You don't need to see the bill. You will see it whenever we want to give it to you. You don't need it. All we are doing down here is playing tiddlywinks with national security.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with that. We disagree with that. I think this is an unfair way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have the privilege to serve on the Intelligence Com-

mittee now, but in the 1980s I did. Then, following that, in the 1990s when I served in California as the attorney general, I recall getting security briefings from the intelligence community from Washington, DC.

It was during the Clinton administration that Admiral McConnell was the head of the NSA. I do not recall any partisan or bipartisan dispute about his qualifications, his professionalism or his judgment. He is the man that the President has brought out of retirement to be the Director of National Intelligence. He is the one that has presented to us in open and in closed testimony why we need this.

I think it is fair for us to ask, if we are getting a draft that he has rejected, why it is the draft that is going to be presented to us under the suspension calendar. Unless we have changed the rules of the House in the 16 years I was gone, the whole concept of a suspension bill is that you suspend all the rules for noncontroversial bills. Noncontroversial bills. If the head of our intelligence services believes that this is so controversial we ought to reject this, then why is it being brought up under this kind of a suspension?

Now, I have tried to work and have worked with the gentlewoman from California on many occasions getting bipartisan legislation through this floor. But this is the single most important bill that I have seen brought up in the 3 years that I have been back, and maybe in the 10 years I was here before.

This goes to the question of whether we take our blinders off with respect to intelligence, with respect to what kind of chatter that is going on around the world. And, yes, they say we all agree that foreign-to-foreign communications ought to be not under the purview of the Court, because we understand that has never been protected under the Constitution. We have been informed that the draft that we are talking about would not allow us to do that in the way it is necessary to protect this Nation.

That is why it is so important; not that it is partisan, not that somebody came here under one rule or another, but because the head of intelligence for the United States has said we can't accept this draft. If he says that, we ought to listen to him. We ought to try and get something that will work.

So let's forget about this nonsense of partisanship. Let's not get up here, shake something out here in the hand and say, well, you have had it long enough. I don't know how long it took the Constitution to be written from beginning to end. It wasn't how long it took. It is the words they put there. It is what they actually produced. That is what we are going to be judged by; not by how many hours we were here, but whether we got it right.

The Director of National Intelligence has told us we have gotten it wrong now. All our people back home are in jeopardy. We are in jeopardy because it